

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2007, which reopens prosecution in view of the Appeal Brief filed September 11, 2007. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are pending. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are rejected. No claims have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and claim 39 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 remain pending in the present application.

Claim 39 has been added to specifically recite a content server and a replica server, which is supported by the specification. (See, e.g., p. 8, line 1 – p. 10, line 10, FIGS. 2-4).

During a telephone call, the Examiner explained to Attorney for Applicant the Examiner's withdrawal the §112 rejection is the basis for the new grounds of rejection set forth in the present Office Action. The §103 rejections, set forth below, are the same those set forth in the Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007 (the Office Action immediately prior to the filing of Applicant's Appeal Brief).

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780 (Levergood) in view of the Fileview Functionality Sheet (Fileview). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant's invention generally relates to a network environment where a client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server. As described in independent claims 1, 13, and 25, in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the first server, the first server determines if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file. The first server generates a

transfer ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization access. The transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server. In response to receiving the transfer ticket from the client by the second server, the second server redirects the client back to itself with a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server. When the second server receives the URL ticket from the client, it verifies the URI ticket on the second server and returns the file.

In contrast, Levergood discloses a client request made with a URL from a web browser. A content server redirects the client to an authentication server. The authentication server interrogates the client and then issues an SID to a qualified client. A valid SID typically comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time, the IP address of the user computer, and a digital signature. The authentication server then forwards a new request consisting of the original URL appended by the SI to the client in a Redirect. The modified request formed by a new URL is automatically forwarded by the client browser to the content server. When the content server receives a URL request accompanied by an SID, it logs the URL with the SID and the user IP address in a transaction log and proceeds to validate the SID. When the SID is so validated, the content server sends the requested document for display by the client's web browser. (Col. 3, lines 21-49).

Levergood does not teach or suggest the elements claimed by Applicant in the present application. First, Levergood does not disclose the generation of a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server. Levergood instead discloses the authentication server issuing of a valid SID that includes "a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time such as date, the IP address of the user computer, and an unforgettable digital signature." (Col 3, lines 33-47). The

authentication server can then forward a new request consisting of the original URL appended by the SID to the client in a Redirect. Since the SID includes the IP address of the user computer, the modified request formed by the new URL that is forwarded to the content server is bound to the client address apparent to the first server. See also Appeal Brief of 9/11/07, pp. 13-14. Examiner cites Levergood at column 3, lines 37-42 as disclosing a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server, but this is erroneous for the reasons described above. The SID in Levergood is issued by the authentication server, and no modification is performed to the SID before it is sent to the content server, the new URL forwarded to the content server is not bound to the client address apparent to the second server.

For at least these reasons, Levergood fails to teach or suggest a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server and a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server.

A secondary reference stands or falls with the primary reference. Because Levergood fails to teach or suggest a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server and a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server, a combination of Levergood with FileNet, also fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, and 25 are patentable over these references, and claims 3-6, 8-10, 12, 15-18, 20-22, 24, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are allowable because they depend upon allowable independent claims.

Claim 39 has been added to specifically recite a content server and a replica server. Although Levergood discloses an authentication server, Levergood fails to disclose a content server where files are copied from the content server to a replica server.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 are allowable over the cited references. Because the

secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/  
Stephen G. Sullivan  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38329  
Telephone No.: 650 969-7474

Date: March 12, 2008